

Bolboceras win) must lose, and the generic component of their cherished binomina must be changed, since in the opinion of all the specialists the names involved are subjective synonyms, more or less equivalent in frequency of usage. What to do in such a case? To count the number of species? There are ten New World and two Old World species of the genus (not one, as stated in BZN 59: 246). *Odonteus orientalis* Mittal, 1998 (as *Odontaeus*) described from the Uttar Pradesh province (India) has to be added to the list (Mittal, 1998). To toss a coin? To manipulate the facts? Or, perhaps, to use a simple and unequivocal, but for some probably too old-fashioned Principle of Priority? The latter is, in our opinion, the only acceptable arbiter in this and similar cases.

Therefore we unconditionally support the suggestions formulated by Krell et al. (BZN 60: 309) resulting in acceptance of *Odonteus* Samouelle, 1819 as a valid name of the genus. We also cannot see any reason for continuation of this debate.

Additional reference

Mittal, J.C. 1998: New record of genus *Odontaeus* Klug (Coleoptera, Scarabaeidae: Geotrupinae) with a new species from Oriental Region. *Journal of Entomological Research*, 22: 385–386.

Comment on the proposed precedence of *Nematois australis* Heydenreich, 1851 (currently *Adela australis*; Insecta, Lepidoptera) over *Tinea aldrovandella* Villers, 1789

(Case 3271; see BZN 60: 290–292)

Antonio Vives

SHILAP, Apartado de Correos, 331, E-28080, Madrid, Spain

I write in support of the application to give the name *Nematois australis* Heydenreich, 1851 precedence over *Tinea aldrovandella* Villers, 1789 whenever the two are considered to be synonyms. I agree with the opinion of the authors that the identity of the nominal species *T. aldrovaniella* Villers, 1789 cannot be established with certainty. The name *T. aldrovandella* Villers, 1789 should be considered a nomen oblitum.